MECKLENBURG.

Foreible Statements Concerning the "Original" Declaration.

Charles R. Jones, of Charlotte, Reasons in Favor of the 20th.

DR. WELLING'S STATEMENT.

The President of Columbian University Believes Only in the Later "Resolves."

How the North Carolinians May Have Been Deceived.

> C. R. JONES' ARGUMENT. CHARLOTTE, N. C., May 7, 1875.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD :-I take pleasure in availing myself of the opportunity afforded me, and through me to my people. of offering some thoughts touching the validity of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, which took place in the town of Charlotte, on the 20th day of May, 1775, within a stone's throw of the place in which I now write. Born and reared among the traditions of the past hundred years, it would, indeed, be treason to deny that such a declaration was made, and that, too, at the time stated above. From that time to the present the universal belief, with a few isolated exceptions, is that Colonel Thomas Polk, then colonel of the militia of the county of Mecklenburg, called a convention of the people of the county, in consequence of the generally disturbed condition of society, occasioned by the oppressions of the mother country, by and through the illegal exactions of the officers of the British Crown. That Convention assembled in Charlotte on the 19th day of May, 1775, and so great was the feeling on the part of the participators in the proceedings of the Convention that the session was prolonged until the morning of the 20th. Later in the evening of the 19th an express messenger arrived with information of the battle of Lexington, Mass., bringing intelligence that

BLOOD HAD BEEN SPILT in defence of American freedom just one month before, and, so great was the feeling of sympathy on the part of the actors of that immortal occasion, that those who had refrained from actually committing themselves to an open declaration of independence no longer hesitated, but at once coincided with such men as Dr. Ephraim Brevard.

This is all we claim, except that immediately after that event, and long prior to the Declaration of Independence, which occurred at Philadelphia in 1776, the citizens of Mecklenburg county took steps to put themselves on a war footing and made good their bold Declaration by taking an active and memorable part in the seven years' struggle for independence which followed the general declaration of war on the part of the United

The citizens of the State of North Car "na are making considerable preparations to presente such an important epoch in the an of their history on the occasion of the Centenn unniversary, which takes place on the 20th inst., and it is due to us and the words of truth to say, that while there may be some who doubt the gennimeness of the Declaration, there exists no disbelief among our people. Inasmuch as there have been at different periods since 1820 occasional discussions as to the authenticity of the Mecklenburg Declaration, it may not be out of place for me to notice in extenso some of the arguments

for me to notice in extenso some of the arguments which have been brought forward in order that they may be properly and duly answered to the satingaction of any unprejudiced mind.

Wien the bothers arose.

The first time the authenticity of this Declaration was ever coupled was in 1819. In that year, as a matter of information and interest, some missachusetts paper—the Som, I think—published the Declaration, with an intimation on the part of the cition that he believed it to be genuine. Mr. John Adams, in a private correspondence with Mr. Thomas Jefferson, forwarded that gentleman a copy of the paper containing the Declaration, at the same time stating that he fMr. Adams believed it to be genuine. In Mr. Jefferson's reply he treated the whole matter as an "unjustifiable quiz." The publication of this letter at that time created considerable exectement in North Carolina, particularly among the descendants of the patrio's of the Revolution then living in Mecklenburg county, and measures were taken by the Legislature of North Carolina (as it had become a State matter) to collect and arrange the documents relative to the Macklenburg Declaration, which were published in 18s1, and by these and other published in 18s1, and by these

the documents relative to the Meckienourg Declaration, which were published in 18si, and by these and other published ins which have subsequently appeared, the authenticity of the Declaration is established beyond cavil or doubt.

It is unnecessity for us, at this late day, to caimminate the character of Mr. Jefferson, resting as it does on a more solid and enduring foundation than the simple writing of the American Declaration of independence at Philadelphia, but at the same time it is both necessary and proper for us to vindicate and defend the honors which justly and truly belong to hecklenburg and her sons.

proper for us to vindicate and defend the honors which justify and truly belong to higher the series of higher the series of himself and reached, so to speak, the acme of human greatness. To have acknowledged that he had reached, so to speak, the acme of human greatness. To have acknowledged that he had copied any portion of his immortal Declaration, which was so sofemily and formally adopted and signed at Philadelphia on the 4th cay of July, 1775, from a set of "resolves" adopted therees months before by the patriots (who were mostly farmers, and men then unknown to lame), of Mecklenburg, wound be to rob at least one jewel from the diagen that had been awarded him by the whole American people. He accordingly denounced the whole thing as a "houx," and did what he could to make other people as incredulous as he himself was; but such an anundant array of evidence was presented as to no longer leave any doubt about the whole matter. So great was the feeling that in 1835 an immense celebration was held in Charlotte, and in no longer leave any doubt about the whole matter. So great was the feeling that in 1856 an immense celebration was held in Charlotte, and in the procession which took place were not less than seventy-five old men, none of them less than seventy-five years of age, each of whom wore a badge, on which was printed, "20th May, 175," thus giving, at one time, seventy-five living witnesses of the truin of the Mecklenburg Declaration, here were living, truthful witnesses, uncontradicted, and men whose words could not be contradicted, giving plain, unmistakable evidence, which could not be set aside. In addition to thase witnesses, i may state that the common traditions of the whole country sustain the 20th of May Declaration.

which have come down to us on the pages of his tory, which are as troad as the earth itself, which, when proof is demanded, are not susceptible of demonstration. Dr. Whately wrote a mook to prove that he such person as Napoleon Konaparte ever existed, and Mr. Jetterson himself dounted the existence of Jesus Christ, and yet can any same mind deny the existence of either, not making any reference to the religious belief held by many on this subject. I am not able at this day to produce stronger testimony than the traditions of a hundred years, among an intelligent people, and no stronger proofs should be called for. A part of the evidence which we are able to submit, in addition to the cloud of testimore to submit, in addition to the cloud of testi-THESE ARE FACTS able to submit, in addition to the cloud of testi-mony which can be obtained, is the despatch of Governor Marin to his government, in which he declares that "the resolves of the people stying themselves a committee for the county of Mecklenburg, most traitorously declaring county of Meckienourg, most fraitorously declaring the entire dissolution of the laws, government and constitution of this country, setting up a system of rule and regulation repugnant to the laws and subversive of the Majesty's government. It is a system of rule and regulation repugnant to the laws and subversive of the Majesty's government. It is a system of the setting the fact that on the tombstone of the Rev. Hezekiah J. Baich, one of the signers of the Meckiebburg Declaration, at Popiar Fent churchyard, near this place, is interesting that ne was a member of that fortous band that met at Charlotte on the 20th day of May, 173, and declared independence. Also the formstone of Rev. Humphrey Hunter, buried at the combistone of the pions people who frequent these chaircass of ded to pay their devotions to the Detty ever presumed to doubt that takes alient memorials were anything out the truth. To suppose anything site would stamp their memory, dear to the people of the State, with infamy and diagrace.

Martin, was the only declaration ever made. In answer to the query I will state that the Secretary, John McKnitt Alexander, kept the only record of the proceedings which were known to be in existence in 1800, and that in April of that year his mansion was destroyed by fire, and the hook containing the important occument was borned. The Declaration was printed in the Cape Fear Mercury, one of the two papers then published in North Carolina, a copy of which was sent to his government by Governor Martin on the 30th of June of the same year, then a refugee on one of the Majesty's ships of war in the Lower Cape Fear, and denounced by him as above quoted. In the year 1863 Colonel John H. Wheeler, North Carolina's most able historian, visited London, carrying with him a letter of war in the Lower case Fear, and demonated by John H. Wheeler, North Carolina's most able mistorian, visited London, carrying with him a letter of introduction from the Hon. Z. B. Vanne, then Governor of North Carolina, to the Hon. James Mason, then Commissioner of the Confederate States in England, with a view of gathering up such evidence as might be attainable in regard to the colonial history of North Carolina. He found many documents relating to the early history of North Carolina, both as a colony and as a State, of which he took copies, with a view of publishing them in a second edition of his "Historical Sketches of North Carolina." He found the despatch of Governor Martin relating to the Declaration, but the copy of the Cape Fear Mirecry, which was said to have contained the Declaration referred to, was not to be found, and its absence left room to donot either that it never existed or that it did not contain the Declaration, as chalmed by our people. A note in pencil stated that it had been taken out of the odice by Governor Andrew Stevenson, of Kentucky, then Minister of the United States to the Court of St. James, and that it had never been returned. Upon the return of Colonel Wheeler to the United States he addressed a letter to the Hon. John W. Stevenson, now United States Senator from Kentucky, and the son of the gentleman referred to, informing him that the missing paper had been lost and requesting his aid in finding it it should be among any of his father's papers. Mr. Stevenson answered that after due and diligent search among his tather's papers (his father being deat) the missing copy of the Cape Fear Mercury could not be found, out that despatches and other memorands had been found which indicated that the paper had been in the possession of his father.

of his latter.

Had this little newspaper slip been found either in the possession of the British Historical Society or in the hands of Mr. Stevenson or his heirs there would have been no possible grounds for any controversy or had not the original copy, in possession of Mr. Alexander, the secretary of the meeting, been destroyed, Mr. Goodloe and other doubters would not have come to the front with their peculiar and unnatural arguments to deny the Mockienum Declaration of the 20th of May. But after all the effort to obtain this paper and the faiture to do so, in its absence we naturally inquire for other evidence, and we turn to that unerring tradition which can be substantiated in a hundred families in the county of Mecklenourg to-day. Does the world doubt that Julius Casar lived, and yet who could prove it to the satisfac-THE LOST LINK. to-day. Does the world doubt that Julius Casar Ired, and yet who could prove it to us satisfaction of a court of justice? Meckienburg has produced two Presidents of the United States, Andrew Jackson and James K. Polk, both men of fearning and eminence, and both of whom in their lives gave undestating belief in the Declaration of Independence which was declared at Charlotte on the 20th May, 1775, and yet the existence of a few court records, land deeds, &c., which may be destroyed by fire within the next twenty-four hours, are the only evidence, legal of course, that we have that they ever formed part of our community, and, with these papers destroyed, a hundred years hence the world might safely doubt that either gentleman ever lived at all.

formed part of our community, and, with these papers destroyed, a hundred years hence the world might safely doubt that either gentleman ever fived at all.

I may conclude this letter by saying that whatever doubts may exist on the part of the world at large in regard to the Declaration which we claim, there exists none whatever on the part of the people of Mecklenburg, and although there is no substantial grounds for disbelief, in the name of my people I thank the Herald, the greatest meios paper of the age, for its effort to unveit the truth of history, however obscure it may appear, satisfied as I am that the people of Mecklenburg, the descendants of the patriots of the Bevolution, have nothing to lear from the closest investigation into the truth or faisity of our claims. The name of Mecklenburg will ever adorn the pages of the history of our great country. Her action in the days of 70 was all that her most loving son to-day would have desired. But that is not enough; she sent forth her sons in the war of 1812 as well as in the days of the Revolution in answer to her country's call; and again in the war with Mexico there were no truer defenders of the Stars and Stripes than the sons of Mecklenburg, and last, though not least, when the techning throughout this country in 1861 the "flotte" "Bethel," the troops on the the treatment which met the twent with the treatment which met the twent with the pages of that citter contest—who met McDowell at Manassas and Buil Run and who surrennered to Grant at Appomatiox four years later—Mecklenburg turnished considerably more than her quota; and, knowing them as I do, I have no hesitation in saying that they would be just as quick to answer a call of the government to-day as they were in 1776, in 1812, in 1846 or in 1861.

Pardon me for this digression from the main subject, and allow me only to add that the time as my command will not allow me to colinte such

1 am, very respectfully, your obedient servant, CHARLES IL JONES.

J. C. WELLING'S LETTER. WASHINGTON, May 10, 1875.

To the Editor of the Herald:—

1 have the honor to acknowledge the reception of your note, in which you ask me to prepare pendence" purporting to have been adopted and promuigated by a portion of the people of Mecklenourg county, in the State of North Carolina, on the 20th of May, 1775.

plication I am, it is presumed, indebted to the fact that since the year 1856, when I made my first pubheation on this topic in the columns of the Na. tional Intelligencer, I have taken an humble part in the historical controversy watch has so long been waged over this document, with regard alian to the genuineness of its authorship and the authenticity of its contents.

As I have been led by my investigations to controvert the traditional and popular optmons held in North Carolina on this topic it gives me pleasure to state that I have found nothing in these investigations which seems in the slightest degree to detract from the exaited patriotism of the Mecklenburg worthles of 1775 or lower the pious veneration in which they are held by their descendants of the present day. On the contrary, I suppose that the views which I have been compelled to adopt, in common with more learned historical critics, such as Mr. Bancroft and the late Peter Force, are the only views which can be made consistent with a loyal and intelligent admiration of the Mecklenburg heroes, as they are believed to be the only views which can stand the ultimate scrutiny of an impartial mind when all the facts of the case are put in the record. I attach the more importance to this statement, which I place at the very threshold of my communication, because I am unwilling to have it supposed, even for a moment, that I have proposed to myself the shallow pleasures of the mere iconoclast in undertaking the work of research upon this question, and in subsequently making public the results of that research. It is aoped that even the cursory view to which I must be restricted in the present discussion will suffice to show that in vincicating the truth of history in this matter it is not necessary, in the least degree, to detract from the hereditary renown and preeminent patriotism of the stalwart and entightened men who adorned the annals of Mecklenburg county during the Revolutionary era. Certain it s that I profess myself to be their fervent admirer. and in numbly wiping from their tombstones the lichens and moss of more than half a century I confess as well to the reverent homage as to the painstaking zeal of an Old Mortality. If the false imbus which has gathered around their brows

tory of North Carolina, and that a copy was sent to General W. R. Davie. J. M'KNIII.

tery of North Carolina, and that a copy was sent to General W. R. Davis.

The Meckien Dury Declaration of Independence was thus published for the first time and certified by Dr. J. McKnitt Acxander win the suppression of his paternan name. The Declaration as published was accompanied with an instortical narrative purporting to explain the circumstances in which to regionated, and this narrative professes, by the date placed at its head, to have been written on the 20th of May, 1775. This representation, however, has no ioundation in fact, as the narrative undertakes to recite events which occurred not only days, but even years, after that date. Such a mode of recording versacious history is, to say the least, very inartistic, though it is not necessary to impute any irradulent design in the premises. The fact that Dr. J. McKnitt Alexander, son of old John McKnitt Alexander, suppressed his pairony mic in certifying to the genniueness of the copy he had made from the papers of his father, has been cired in evidence as eviacing a want of cander on his pair, but his defenders at the present day plead in extenuation of this apparent concentiment that he often omitted the surame from his signature because of the commonness of the name of Alexander in Meckienburg county and its vicinage.

Statement as entirely satisfactory, the historical ordic of the present day, in intrust irrating described in making a copy of such an important paper. Dr. J. McKnitt- we may so call him since that is the name he preferred—had stated, as we have seen in the certificate attached to his publication in the year 1819, that his father appeared from the record on file? to have given a copy of the Meckienburg Declaration, among other persons, to Gene al W. R. Davie, a distinguished citizen of North Carolina, Search was instituted for this copy among the papers left by General Davie at his decease, and the document was found in the weil-known, and as we are assured by competent testimony, in the unmistakable handwriting of the venerable John

find that there is nothing on which to rest our feet. If the authenticity of this Deciaration be conceded—that is, it it be admitted that there may have been such a declaration—the shape in which we have it is eer anny not gratine. Water cannot rise above its level, and just as little can the Mecalenburg Declaration of inde-pendence, of May 20, 1775, ever hope to rise higher than its source in the memory of John McKhitt Alexander, writing out his best recollections of transactions and resolutions which had so far laded from his mind that he is irank to confess "they may not correspond with the original records." As it is supposed by our North Caronna friends that the Meckienburg, Declaration of independence, whatever may have been its purport, was the composition of Dr. Epitrain Brevard, a pairiotic critizen of Meckienburg, in 1775, and as it is in evidence that we have to-day only so much of that Declaration as John McKhitt Alexander could recall in the year lead, without a line of the original text to gained him, it follows that the absence of all genuineness in the document must be freely antited even by those who would most like to behave in its authenticity. The reader will bear in mind that the question of genuineness in such a discussion as this relates to the authorization.

In Miroffant Consideration.

In Miroff and Consideration of independence, as we now have it, is not a genuine document, if have next to consider the question of its authenticity. Was there any declaration of independence, is not a genuine document, if have next to consider the question of its authenticity. Was there any declaration of independence in a consideration of the pendence in have next to consider the question of its authenticity.

that the Meckienburg Decharation of Independence, as we now have it, is not a genethe document, it have next to consider the question of its authenticity. Was there day declaration of independence made by a portion of the people of Meckienburg on the 20th of May, 175-7. Did the patriots of Meckienburg, on that day, formally and forever "dissolve fine potitical bands which had connected them with the mother country, and absolve themselves from an allegiance to the British Crown." The impossibility of such a supposition is negatived by a great variety of most irrefragable proofs derived from the contemporaneous history of North Carolina. In the first place, I point to the fact that the same patriots who, it is alleged, took part in this declaration of May 20, 1775, are known from Decimentary evidence to have participated in a committee meeting of Meckienburg county only eleven days afterward, to wit, on the dist of May, and at that the efficiency of Meckienburg county only eleven days afterward, to wit, on the dist of May, and at that the eling they adopted a set of recontitions which, though in the highest degree creditable to their revolutionary patriotism, are, nevertheless, of such a tenor as to silence the aspotaces that these same men had only eleven days before renounced their allegiance to the British Crown, unless, indeed, we are to believe that in spite of the brave words spoken by their on the 20th of May they were swift to speak in words of "outled breath" after the brief literval of reconsideration in the meckienburg becake in our reconsideration in the meckienburg becake in the seamned of the policy cast in the firmest mounds of forticion as well as of courage, forbrids me to entertain such an injurious suspicion without some proof of the fact, and proof there is uone except such as may be drawn from the assumption that he hecklenburg beclaration is genuine document. Against the "recollections" of John McKintt Alexander, whether regard be had to their substance or their form, I set the ipsissimal pe

tracted the Declaration eleven days afterward. Were they men of suca infirm purpose as this? Rut the negative evidence does not end here. A little more than three months after the date of May 20, 1775, when John McKnitt Alexander, Thomas Polk and others are represented to have "declared independence," we find these very leaders sitting in the North Carolina Provincial Congress, and on the 23d of August, 1775, we further find them signing a lest of loyally, in "profession of their allegiance to the King ahd acknowledging the constitutional executive power of government." Had these men declared independence on the 20th of May, 1775. To suppose so is to load their hames and memories with the most terrible of imputations, and I know of nothing in their honorable and manly characters which can justify such a tremennous impeacument of either their courage or their candor as we must allow to its against them if they produced themselves independent of Great Britain on the 20th of May, 1775, and plighted their vows of allegiance a little more than three months afterward; But this is not all. The delegates sixting in this North Carolina Provincial Congress irom Meckienburg, including John McKnitt Alexander, the sponsor of the so-called bedaration of Independence, Joined with their colleagues in a unnaumous address to the people of Great Britain.

John McKnitt Alexander, with all nis colleagues in a unnaumous address to the people of Great Britain.

John McKnitt Alexander, with all nis colleagues in a unnaumous address to the people of Great Britain.

John McKnitt Alexander with all nis colleagues in a unnaumous address to the people of Great Britain.

John McKnitt Alexander with all nis colleagues in a unnaumous and the months and the months and the months are the congress, and the McKnitt Alexander furbished up from memory after the lapse of more than a quarter of a century.

Was, then, the Mackienburg Declaration of Independence of May 29, 1775, the pure and sample counage of John McKnitt Alexander had seen the record

nized in them at once the authentic resolutions which John McKnitt Alexarder had sought to reproduce, but of which he had succeeded in making only a feeble trayesty. And in reaching this conclusion it is more to the praise of Mr. Force's historical sagnetty, trained though he was in such researches, that at that time—in 1835—he did not know, as we know now, that Alexander's version of the Meckienourg resolution was confessedly drawn from his "best recollection and bellet." That significant fact was not suffered to transpice in North Carolina until the year 1835, though the committee of the North Carolina Legislature, charged in the year 1850 with the publication of evidence in support of the genuineness and antenticity of the so-called Declaration of May 20, must have had the "Davie copy" of that document in their bands. The certificate mublished under the suprrintendence of Governor Swain at a later date unfortunitely escaped their notice, otherwise it might have greatly monified their concusions.

the law to worthly of notice here to observe that the forezons statement indeamentally correct, may not be recogned with the original record of the terms and purer were brant with the original record of the terms But it will be said that there are a dozen or

thely credible. But our Norta Carolina friends seem to forget that the statement dues not at all help the pretensions of the Meckienourg Declaration of Independence as now received and held among them on the authority of John McKaitt Alexander, for we have the confession of Mr. Alexander, for we have the confession of Mr. Alexander that the existing version of the Meckienourg Declaration of May 20, 1775, was verified by him, from memory, in the year 1800. If, in the year 1800, If, in the year 1800 year, in the paper subsequently complied by Mr. Alexander the original records of the Mckleinburg committee were still in Mr. Alexander's possession. If we could now recover the actual transcript of these original records, as given by Mr. Alexander to Dr. Wimannson, before his papers were burned, we should unifornitedly find it to be a copy of the proceedings and on the 2010 of May, 1775. If it should arm out to be the true record of an earlier meeting, really held on the 2010 of May, 1775. If it should be inconsistent with the grave and deliberate steps publicly taken by tiese same men only elevan days afterward. It is proof enough in derogation from the trustworthiness of Mr. Alexander's recoilections in the year 1800 that they fy in the face of documentary evidence known to be both genuine and anthenic, and that iney involve the most damaging reflections on the conduct and characters of the men to whom they relate, not even excepting himself, for he signed the "less of Loy ally" in the North Carolina Provincial Congress as late as April 4, 1776, only three months before the astonial Declaration of Independence made by the Gene

which were seen, we have the description of these proceedings never came to his knowledge in Paingeiphia. We have the same asseverations from John Adams, accompanied with his reasons for holding it morally impressible toat such a paper could have come to Philadelphia without his knowing the fact at the time. We have documentary proof that the existence of anything like a Deciaration of Independence on the 20th of May, 1775, was unknown in the adjoining county of Rowan on the first day of John, 1775, for on that day, twelve days after the date of the alleged Deciaration, the committee of Rowan county invited their neighbors of Meckienburg to unite with them in prayers for "the House of Handwer and its legal succession." We have the written statement of James Iredell, an eminent citizen of North Carolina, afterward an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court—a statement made in the year 1777, when in entire dissolution of the laws, government, and selected around their brows and constitution of the laws, and subjects agreed around their brows and constitution of regulations, and the properties of the Mexician of the properties of the Mexician of the space of

Before that noteworthy Declaration had been recovered the Alexander version was put in circulation, and it was entirely nature i that the people of North Carolina, justly proud of their virtuous ancestors, should attach their laith to the story, coinciding as it did with the general drift of their local traditions respecting the transcendent patroctism of the innabitants of Mecklenburg. The sincerity of their faith in the "Mecklenburg. The sincerity of their faith in the "Mecklenburg D-cuaration of inpenendence" is not to be questioned. They are the last people who would make a claim which they do not believe to be well founded. It is their misfortune that they were called to pronounce on the merits of the Alexander version before they knew that it was written from memory slone, and belore the the honor of the Mccklenburg heroes on the memorable Mediarations of May Jl. On that ground they are safe from assault, and on that ground they are safe from assault, and on that ground they may challenge for the Mecklenburg fathers the plous homage and reverent gratitude of the whole people of the United States. For the people of Mecklenburg were the first in all America, so far as I am aware, to solve the problem of local self-government, as that problem was presented to them in the year 1775. The laws of Great Britain had fallen into practical desuctade from the virtual overthrow of the British power in North Carolina. Neither the Continental Congress nor the Provincial Congress of the colony had provided any substitute for this lapse of civil government. With a major of the structure politics which has no rival in any recorded example of our Revolutionary history at that early day, the Committee of Mecklenburg body grappled with this formidable difficulty—a difficulty which was then vexing the wisest minds on the Continent. While others were deliberating and crying aloud for help from the general Congress the men of Mecklenburg acted on the spot, and nelped themselves to a wise and well considered municipal government, which proved adequate to all the wants of civil society during the transition period between monarchical authority and home rule.

If, then, the patriots and sages of Mecklenburg in 1775 were not the "able arcintects of runn" they have been alleged to be, they were certainly able arcintects of order. They brought civil order out of civil runn. They kept the sacred enartities of home, of parents, culdiene, irlends and heighbors under the regis of law, and thus realized what Cicero has called the highest, as it certainly is the holest, function of organized civil government.

what Olcero has called the discless, as it to list the holest, function of organized civil government.

All honor, then, to the Revolutionary heroes of Mecklenourg! We have only to regret that their descendants should have failed to discern the highest glory of their ancestors, and that in their needless anxiety to protect the reputation of the respectable men who have borne subsequent witness to take disputed point on their admais, they should have erected the fallible recollections of John McKnitt Alexander into a factitions dignity, which he was careful to disclaim for them. There is really no room for controversy in this whole matter if the paper of Mr. Alexander be taken at the value assigned to it by its autor, and those who would give to it a higher authenticity must not only assume to be wise above what he has written, but must also ignore the most salient facts a mposing the record in this case.

JAMES C. WELLING.

CENTENNIAL LOYALTY.

ROBERT E. LEE AND JEFFERSON DAVIS COUN-SELLING ACCEPTANCE OF THE SITUATION. OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES CENTENNIAL COMMMISSIONERS FOR TEXAS, NO. 29 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, May 15, 1875.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:in your issue of this morning, in an editorial alluding to the speech of Jefferson Davis the day before in Texas, you say: --- We congratulate Jederson Davis upon his speech at Houston, Texas, in which he called upon the old Confederate soldiers to give the same devotion to the Stars and Stripes that they had shown to the flag of the lest cause. The influence of a man like Jefferson Davis upon the people who once followed him, if properly exercised, will be of unspeakable benefit in the pacification of the country." With unintended injustice to General Loc, you then add :- "We have always felt that it will be remembered to the discredit of General Lee that at the close of the war he sank into a policy of apathy and silence, and old nothing to reconcile the people he had commanded to the new order of

In vindication of the truth of history, and to remove the "discredit" watch you intimate is the only shadow on the otherwise imperishable fame of one of the most colossal characters of the late civil war, I am constrained to ask you to publish the following:- in his letter accepting the Presidency of Washington College, the late Robert E.

Lee said:—

I think it the duty of every citizen, in the present condition of the country, to do all in his power to aid in the restoration of peace and harmony, and in no way to oppose the policy of the State or general governments directed to that object. It is particularly incumbent on those charged with the instruction of the young to set them an example of submission to authority.

The above memorable and historic sentiment, which so effectually removes the imputation that "at the close of the war General Lee did nothing to reconcile the people he had commanded to the new order of things," is clipped from his letter at the time of its publication in 1869, and has ever since been carried in a memorandum book on my person, as I have treasured it in my heart and sought to practise it in my life. Your editorial, so unintentionally unjust to a great memory, brought vividly to my mind Lee's actual counsel to "the people he had commanded," my long treasured possession of its words of wisdom, and engendered an earnest wish for its reproduction in your columns, to vindicate truth in history.

The sacred oracle hath declared that "he who ruleth his own spirit is greater than he who taketa a city." If it had been true that at the crose of the war General Lee "sank into a policy of apathy and slience," he would have left to fame the renown of a soldier without demonstrating in himseif, as he has, that in the domain of passion and prejudice there are lottler achievements and nooler conquests than captive myriads or subjugated provinces. But General Lee appropriately crowned a fame that, as you intimate, would otherwise have been incomplete, by a moral conquest of himself in actually attempting what you averred he did not-viz., "to reconcile the people he had commanded to the new order of things. Why so few of his former military followers,

then, lacked the moral beroism to imitate his example in also counselling "submission to authority" in the acceptance of the three constitutional amendments, which were "the new order of things," it were profitiess now to discuss, since the late indorsement and acceptance of the new order of things by both political plat-forms, and which both parties are pledged to maintain inviolate. The support of the Baltimore and Cincinnati platform in 1872 by the men of the South, in which they "pledged" themselves "to oppose any reopening of the questions settled by the thirteenth, jourteenth and lifteenth amendments to the constitution," was a final settlement of war balances, the erasure of all vital sectional issues, a practical acquiescence in Lee's advice of submission to authority," and a complete vindication of the patriotism and wisdom of those of Lee's followers who had at an earlier day acred upon his counsel by also accepting "the situation" in order to pacificate the country.

You elequently and truthinly add that "the defeat of the Confederacy will attract the sympathy of millions who respect valor and mourn over misfortune." That which will not the less arrest the attention of the ages that are to follow is the council of the late Confederate chieftains—the one

have been in a state of ferment for the past two years on account of a difference of opinion between the members in regard to certain changes in the form of worship. Buai Jeshurun is the oldest Jewish congregation in New York city, have ing been founded acout forty years ago. The first synagogue was in Eim street, where worship in accordance with ancient Jewish forms was carried on for several years. The edifice proving too small the congregation removed to Broadway, and afterward to Greene street. Subsequently the Greene street property was sold and the proceeds devoted to the purchase of the present synagogue in West Tairty-fourth street, between Seventh avenue and Broadway. For nearly nine months, however, the congregation have been without a regular Rabbi. The last one, Rabbi Vidaver, was a great re ormer, and dissensions arising among his flock he resigned his charge in New York and went to San Francisco, where he accepted a call from the Reformed Jewish church in that city. The membership of Bnai Jeshurun for the past two years has been growing smailer by degrees, the progressive element feeling that a blind adherence to unimportant forms and customs, which were antagonistic to the spirit of the age, was calculated to retard the growth and we fare of the congregation. They argued that certain kinds of that the custom of separating the husband from his wife or the brother from his sister while in the synagogue was not only unnecessary, but arbiagreat re ormer, and dissensions arising among his wife of the brother from his aister while in the synagogue was not only unnecessary, but arbitrary. On the other hand, the conservative element claimed that innovations were dangerous; that the safest blan was to preserve the forms which had been handed down to them from passages. They were good enough for their lathers, consequently they must be good enough for them. These forms were observed by orthodox Jews the world over; and, furthermore, that to nermit the proposed so-called "reforms" was contrary to the spirit and letter of the constitution adopted at the founding of the congregation over forty years ago. The controversy grew to such dimensions and such serious consequences were threatened that about two months ago the Board of Trustees appointed two committees representing both sides of the question, who were instruded to prepare reports. Subsequently the following notice was issued, which explains itself:—

CONGREGATION BNAI JESTICIEN

SIN-You are requested to attend a general meeting of
the congregation at the synagogue chambers. Thirtyfourth street, on Sunday, May 16th inst, at init-pare
two P. M. to consider and take action upon a plan
recommended for adoption by a Joint Committee arpointed by the Board of trustees, relative to the introduction of an organ and the alteration of seats into
pews. pews.

adjugate the state of th

By order of the Board, E. DE YOUNG, secretary.

By order of the Board, E. DE YOUNG, secretary.

THE MEETING YESTERDAY.

When the meeting was called to order, which was shortly after the hour appointed, the synagorie chamber was crowned to excess with this wealthy and industrial memoers of the congregation. No representantives of the press were permitted to be present, and it was understood that as it was a "family quarrel" the members were piedged to the utmost secrecy, Mr. M. Strasburger occupied the chair, and an excited discussion, which lasted from naif-past two until seven P. M., was at once inaugurated. The report of the "conservatives," which did not differ in any material respect from the outline given above, was first presented. The report of the progressives showed the following facts:—

The present number of members was 215. The

showed the following facts:—

The present number of members was 215. The value of seats nursh ased by members in good standing was as follows:—00 contents to seats 1, \$2.00 cache \$11.000 contents to seats 1, \$2.00 cache \$11.000 contents contents to \$4.00 cache \$11.000 contents contents at \$100 \$10.000 cache \$10.000 contents \$10 of pews, \$2,300, rent of temporary seals during holidays, \$1,300; receipts from other sucress \$1,000; there will remain a definiency of \$6,300. Total, \$19,000. The remain a definiency of \$6,300. Total, \$19,000. To make up this deficiency we propose to levy a pop reci assessment on the valuation of the pews or seats purchased by members as follows: - ror two seats, the full assessment on their valuation and for all seats exceeding two in number in any since pew, one-half the assessment on valuation of the additional seats in such pews purchased by a member. Thus, supposing the valuation of a pew to be \$1,000, the owner will pay an assessment on valuation of two seats to \$400, and one half on \$500, \$200; total, \$700, or equal to seven-tenths of the valuation of the entire number of seats purchased will be subject to the subject to the entire pew. Assuming has fifty per center of the subject to t

pose."

It was agreed that both reports should be voted non-together and when the roll was called it was found that there were 34 in layor of adhering to the ancient customs, while 30 votes were cast in favor of the proposed reforms. Amid great excitement, however, several votes on both sides were challenged, but when the flual vote was taken the

GLENDENNING ON THE WARPATH.

A FIEBCE ATTACK ON THE OLD POGIES OF THE CHURCH-BE VINDICATES HIS THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS.

The attendance at the "Church of the Scandal," in Jersey City, yesterday, was not quite as large as on the previous Sunday, but those who attended were treated to a philippic seidom heard from a pulpit. Mr. Glendenning was in his seas at an early hour, and the pulpit was decorated with bouquets, as on the three previous Sundays. It was evident from Mr. Glendenning's earnestness in the opening prayer that war to the knife was to declared against somebody. His text, taken in the abstract, was simple, but, applied to his purthe abstract, was simple, but, applied to his purpose, was scathing. It was from Proverbs, xiv., 10—"line simple believeth every word, but the prudent man looketh well to his going." Taking advantage of the charge of bereay preferred against him by one of the ciders of the church, Mr. Glendenning hit back in the following style:—It is far better to awake to the direct confusion in our thinking than to repose in ignorance. Those indexible dogmas, in which so many find repose, must scoper or later give way to new developments in the progress of human thought. There is something good in every system, and this good frees itself from what is impure and assimilates itself to the progress of human thought. There is something good in every system, and this good frees itself from what is impure and assimilates taself to the good in other systems. What is good is permanent, what is impure is transient. Thus a new religion is iounded without forms the highest expression of truth, and this again will in time give way as namen thought progresses and new discoveries are made. Thus it is that the neresy of yesterday becomes the orthodoxy of to-day. The high priests of intellectual progress are daily slain at the altar of thought. Socrates was condemned to drink the latal cup because he instituted a reaction in favority of fruth. Galileo was shut within prison walls because he established the theory of planetary motion. At the present day a man cannot stand in the pulpit and give expression to some new development of truth without being monded down by a class of the latty that deem themselves the only orthodox memoers, when, in point of fact, they are guorantly orthodox. (There was a sight movement among the congregation at this point, but no one left the church.) The man who has unbounded confidence in his creed is not the man who raises the hig and dry of hereey against his prethren. His faith is so wear and vaculating that it needs always to be planed to this or that proposition. It was not Voltaire or Rousseau that plunged France into the throse of infidelity and revolution, but it was the conditional sections in the contribution. proposition. It was not Voltaire or Rousseau the plunged France into the throes of infidelity an revolution, but it was the confirmed scopicism. the priesthood. ("That's 117-top," remarked pious-looking individual to us neighbor. "not ne'll give it to 'em," but before his wish was granted the preacher closed auruntly with "lat u bray."